

Appln No. 09/916,243

Amdt date July 21, 2004

Reply to Office action of May 14, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8, 11-19, 21-30, 33-41, 43-52, 55-63, and 65-96 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 23, 45, 67 and 82 have been amended. The amendments find full support in the original specification, claims, and drawings. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and remarks that follow, reconsideration, reexamination, and an early indication of allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-8, 11-19, 21-30, 33-41, 43-52, 55-63, and 65-96 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner contends that the limitation of "providing an ontology description of a data service" recited in claims 1, 23, and 45 is indefinite because it is unclear what ontology description the Applicant is referring to. Applicant respectfully submits that it is unnecessary for Applicant to define or indicate which ontology description is encompassed by these claims as the claims encompass any possible number of ontology descriptions.

It appears that the Examiner is contending that the limitation concerning ontology descriptions is indefinite as overly broad. However, as clearly set forth in M.P.E.P. § 2173.04, breadth is not indefiniteness. The M.P.E.P. specifically provides that "[i]f the scope of the subject matter embraced by the claims is clear, and if applicants have not otherwise indicated that they intend the invention to be of a scope different from that defined in the claims, then the claims

Appln No. 09/916,243
Amdt date July 21, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 14, 2004

comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph." Accordingly, claims 1, 23, and 45 are not indefinite for failure to define the ontology description. However, in an attempt to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1, 23, and 45 so that it now recites that "the ontology description of the data service comprises a description of a data structure associated with the data service." Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 23, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is therefore respectfully requested.

The Examiner contends that the limitation of "providing a parser semantic description of the data set for use by the parser adaptor" recited in claims 21, 43, and 65 is indefinite because it is unclear what semantic description the Applicant is referring to. Applicant respectfully submits that the recited "semantic description" is not indefinite, and is entitled to its ordinary meaning, which encompasses any semantic description. As explained above, that a term may be broad does not mean that the term is indefinite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also contends that claims 67 and 82 include the limitation of "providing the ontology description of a data service," which is allegedly indefinite. The Examiner further rejects these claims due to an informality.

Applicant has thoroughly reviewed claims 67 and 82, but did not find the limitation of "providing the ontology description of a data service." Instead, claims 67 and 82 recite "generating by the workflow the knowledge instance from the data sets using an ontology description of a data service." The recited "ontology description," despite its breadth, is not indefinite. However, in an effort to advance prosecution,

Appln No. 09/916,243
Amdt date July 21, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 14, 2004


Applicant has amended claims 67 and 82 to correct the informality, and to provide a definition for the ontology description. Claims 67 and 82 thus now recite that "the ontology description of the data service comprises a description of a data structure associated with the data service." Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 67 and 82 is therefore respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claims 22, 44, and 66, the Examiner has not indicated which claim elements are indefinite in these claims. In fact, these claims contain a definition of the ontology description that is suggested by the Examiner for claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22, 44, and 66 under 35 U.S.C. 112, is respectfully requested.

For all these reasons, claims 1-8, 11-19, 21-30, 33-41, 43-52, 55-63, and 65-96 are sufficiently definite and allowable. Applicant notes that the Examiner did not cite any prior art against the pending claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a timely indication of allowance of claims 1-8, 11-19, 21-30, 33-41, 43-52, 55-63, and 65-96.

Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview with the Examiner to resolve any issues that are not being resolved via this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Josephine E. Chang
Reg. No. 46,083
626/795-9900

JEC/dlf
MAS PAS569050.1--07/20/04 4:30 PM